

REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 87-101 remain pending in the application, with Claims 87, 92 and 97 being independent. Claims 87-101 have been amended herein.

The drawings were objected to as allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, it was suggested that the first and second determination units are not shown in the drawings. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the physical units are supported by CPU 102 of host computer 110 shown in Figure 17. Moreover, the features of the first and second determination units as recited in the claims have been amended. Such features are believed to be fully supported by the flowchart of Figure 31. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings are requested.

Claims 87-101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, the independent claims have been amended to revise the features of the determination units and steps. As discussed above, the noted features are believed to be fully supported in the specification with regard to the description of Figure 31. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph, rejection are also requested.

Claims 88, 93 and 98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicants have reworded the language questioned by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, rejection are requested.

Claims 97-101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicants have amended independent claim 97 along the lines suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the § 101 rejection is believed to be resolved.

Claims 87, 89-92, 94-97, and 99-101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,467,434 (Hower, Jr. et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,267,727 (DeHority). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hower, Jr. et al. uses a plurality of printers respectively associated with printer profiles, with each printer profile having a list of printer properties available at the printer. A user interface can program a combination of print job selections. The combination of print job selections is transmitted to one of the plurality of printers associated with a selected one of the printer profiles when a combination of print job selections corresponds with the combination of printer properties available at the selected printer. For example, Applicants submit that Hower, Jr. et al. discloses that the medium type is changed into LOGO or PLAIN when 216x356 is set as page size and TAB is set as MEDIUM TYPE.

However, Hower, Jr. et al. is not believed to disclose or suggest the features of the change unit or change step recited in the independent claims. In particular, Hower,

Jr. et al. does not disclose or suggest at least that when it is determined that a user should make a selection of the setting of a second setting item, displaying a window on which the user is allowed to enter a selection, and when the user does not enter a selection to change the setting of the second setting item, not changing the setting of the second setting item corresponding to a changed setting of a first setting item, as is recited in each of the independent claims. Therefore, Hower, Jr. et al. cannot select whether a user should intervene with regard to a change of the second setting item in conformity with the first setting item.

Hower, Jr. et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

DeHority is directed to a printer system that compares document requirements to a printer capability and determines the best match. If there is a mismatch, the system can determine the best match between size, color, weight, and type by determining a mismatch magnitude. The paper with the lowest mismatch magnitude is designated. The user can indicate whether a substitute for a job requirement is allowed. If the user specifies “Notify Me”, the user will be able to complete a specification by using a print job specification menu on the user’s computer. However, even if such features of DeHority were incorporated into Hower, Jr. et al., such combination which still fail to meet the deficiencies of Hower, Jr. et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Accordingly, independent Claims 87, 92 and 97 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection are respectfully

requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 87, 92 and 97. Dependent Claims 88-91, 93-96 and 98-101 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims.

Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW/yr

DC_MAIN 270662v1